Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW	Docket Number (Optional) 15296US01	

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically filed with United States Patent and Trademark Office on ___March 10, 2009_____ Signature _____/Mirut P. Dalal/_____ Typed or printed Name_____Mirut P. Dalal_____	Application Number 10/754,322	Filed 1/9/2004
	First Named Inventor Hatti	
	Art Unit 2624	Examiner Koziol

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).
        Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.

☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.
    See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
    (Form PTO/SB/96)

☒ attorney or agent of record.
    Registration number   44,052   .

☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.
    Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34   .

/Mirut P. Dalal/
_____
Signature

Mirut P. Dalal
_____
Typed or printed name

(312) 775-8063
_____
Telephone number

March 10, 2009
_____
Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

☐   *Total of _____ forms are submitted.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(Attorney Docket No. 15296US01)

In the Application of:	)
	)
	) **Electronically Filed**
Hatti	)
	) **March 10, 2009**
Serial No. 10/754,322	)
	)
Filed: 1/9/2004	)
	)
Examiner: Koziol	)
	)
Group Art Unit: 2624	)
	)
Confirmation No. 7486	)
	)
	)

REQUEST FOR PRE-APPEAL REVIEW

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This correspondence is filed in response to the Office Action of December 8, 2008. Attached please find: (1) Claim Amendments; and (2) Remarks.

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are presently pending and stand rejected. Preappeal review of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of Greene. Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, "providing a first parameter to a first register indicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines" and "providing a second parameter to a second register, indicating that the picture comprises a second number of lines".

Examiner has indicated that Baker discloses "providing a first parameter (fig. 3, also, col. 13, ln 64-67 cont'd col. 14, ln 1-18 "modulated chrominance components") to a first register (fig. 3 item 136, also, col. 13 ln 64-67 cont'd col. 14, ln 1-18 "video output memory") indicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines (col. 13 ln 64-67 cont'd col. 14, ln 1-18, where Baker's 'modulated chrominance components' contribute to the run-length encoded (RLE) image stream, indicating a first number of image lines)".

Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection. Baker notes that "Typically, for the NTSC video format, for instance, the component pixel data includes a luminance component (Y) and two unmodulated chrominance components (U and V). The chrominance components are modulated (U sin(omega t) and V cos (omega*t), where omega=2*pi*F_{sc}) before being combined to form a composite video signal." Assignee respectfully submits that merely modulating the chrominance components of the component pixel data does not result in

2

"indicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines".

Although col. 14, Lines 7-12 state that "Vertical video control information that must be output at the end of each field is also preloaded into the display memory. Preferably, the *horizontal and vertical video control information is run length encoded (RLE)* to reduce the memory required for storage and to reduce bandwidth required in the system", in contrast to Examiner's assertion that "modulated chrominance components' contribute to the run-length encoded (RLE) image stream". Moreover, respectfully submits that mere "run length encoding" the "image stream" or the "vertical video control information" does not result in "indicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines".

Examiner has also indicated that Baker discloses "providing a second parameter (fig. 3, also, col. 13, ln 64-67 cont'd col. 14, ln 1-18 "luminance components") to a second register (fig. 3 item 136, also, col. 13 ln 64-67 cont'd col. 14, ln 1-18 "video output memory") indicating that the picture comprises a second number of lines (col. 13 ln 64-67 cont'd col. 14, ln 1-18, where Baker's 'luminance components' contribute to the run-length encoded (RLE) image stream, indicating a first number of image lines)".

In addition to the reasons indicated above, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection because Examiner is actually referring to the same signal. "componsite video pixel data is generated by simply using table look-up to get the modulated chrominance components and then adding these values to the luminance components. As shown at step 320 of Fig. 3, the composite pixel data is then storedi n

3

the video output memory portion 136 of the display memory 128." Col. 13, Line 64 – Col. 14, line 2. Accordingly, arguendo, even if the foregoing is held to indicate any number of lines, the foregoing does not teach "indicating that the picture comprises a *second* number of lines".

Additionally, Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, "repeatedly providing a last of the first number of lines for scaling or composing or capturing for each of the horizontal synchronization pulses that are associated with line numbers that exceed the first number of lines". Examiner has indicated that the foregoing is taught at Baker, Col. 9, lines 21-42. Column 9, Lines 21-42 discuss that "the PACDAC may have a random access memory (RAM) and additional digital-to-analog converters for graphics." There is simply no discussion of repeatedly providing a last of the first number of lines".

Assignee respectfully traverses the rejections to claims 4 and 9, for each of the reasons indicated with regards to claim 1. Additionally, Assignee traverses the rejection for these additional reasons. Claim 4 recites, among other limitations, "a controller for providing a first parameter to the feeder indicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines". Examiner has indicated that the foregoing is taught at "(fig. 1A item 114 is 'media stream controller' that is interpreted to act as the controller for providing an image for display. Additional control logic is described in col. 25, lines 54-67)".

Assignee respectfully submits that the "Media Stream Controller 114" in FIG. 1A does not provide "a first parameter to the feeder indicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines". It is first noted that "merely providing an image for display" is not the same as

4

"providing a first parameter to the feeder indicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines", as it is possible to provide an image without knowing the number of lines in the image. It is also noted that in col. 25, lines 54-67 describes the control logic 908 in the PACDAC 140. There is no indication that the PACDAC 140, Figure 9 includes any register that indicates the number of lines in the picture. The control logic 908 controls the video FIFO 904 and a run length decoder 920". Col. 25, Lines 56-57. However, neither the video FIFO 904 or the run length decoder 920 are provided a parameter from the media stream controller indicating the number of lines in the picture. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully submits that Baker does not teach "a controller for providing a first parameter to the feeder indicating that the picture comprises a first number of lines".

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee submits that each of the pending claims are now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance.

It is believed that all monies for the actions described herein are provided with this correspondence. To the extent that additional monies are required for any of the actions requested in the correspondence, Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees and credit any overpayments to deposit account 13-0017.

<div style="text-align:right">

Respectfully Submitted

</div>

March 10, 2009

Mirut Dalal
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 44,052

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison – Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000
FAX   (312) 775-8100